

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are pending in the present application. The Official Action rejects Claims 1-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,134,534 to Walker et al. (hereinafter the "Walker '534 patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,386,388 to Sprenger et al. (hereinafter the "Sprenger '388 patent").

The dependencies of Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 27, 29, 30, and 33 have been amended. As explained in further detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the cited references and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

The Walker '534 patent discloses a method, a system, and an article of manufacture for using a computer to process the sale of a cruise ticket. In this regard, the Walker '534 patent discloses a conditional purchase offer (CPO) management system for receiving CPOs from one or more customers, such as cruise or airline passengers, and for evaluating the received CPOs to determine whether any seller is willing to accept the received CPO. The CPOs received from the customers are evaluated against a number of CPO rules defined by a plurality of sellers, such as cruise or airline operators. If the seller accepts the received CPO, the CPO management system binds the customer to form a legally bind contract. The Walker '534 patent provides a CPO management system that includes a plurality of databases, including a customer database 600 and a CPO database 900.

The Sprenger '388 patent discloses an apparatus, a computer program, and a system for managing data. More specifically, the Sprenger '388 patent relates to an apparatus for managing data having a first database for storing system data, a second database for storing client data and at least one database server to control the first and second databases. In addition, the Sprenger '388 patent discloses that externally generated customer identifiers may be cross referenced with customer identifiers in a database.

Independent Claim 1 recites a method for sharing customer information among a plurality of electronic storage facilities. The method includes providing a mass data store including, in a first data record, identifying information for a customer having an associated first customer

identifier. The method further includes receiving identifying information on the customer from an electronic storage facility containing information about the customer including a second customer identifier that is different from the first customer identifier and storing the received identifying information in a second data record. Furthermore, the method includes determining that the identifying information in the first and second data records are associated with the customer and assigning an identifier for the customer based on a result of the determination. Finally, the method of Claim 1 recites cross-referencing the assigned identifier with the identifying information stored in the first and second data records and providing identifying information using the assigned identifier to an electronic storage facility. Independent Claims 7, 13, 19, 23, and 25 include similar recitations in the context of methods and systems.

The Walker '534 patent does not disclose receiving identifying information on the customer from an electronic storage facility containing information about the customer including a second customer identifier that is different from the first customer identifier and storing the received identifying information in a second data record. Instead, the Walker '534 patent specifically discloses in col. 19, lines 16-21 that the customer, not an electronic storage facility, submits information to the system in order to populate the customer database and accordingly, the information is received from a customer for storing in a data record, instead of from an electronic facility as recited in independent Claim 1. In any event, the Walker '534 patent does not disclose receiving first and second customer identifiers that are different from one another.

Additionally, the Official Action finds that the Walker '534 patent discloses assigning an identifier for the customer based on a result of the determination, but acknowledges that the Walker '534 patent does not teach or suggest determining that the information in the first and the second data records are associated with the customer and cross-referencing the assigned identifier with identifying information stored in the first and second data records. However, the Official Action relies on the Sprenger '388 patent as disclosing determining that the information in the first and the second data records are associated with the customer and cross-referencing the assigned identifier with identifying information stored in the first and second data records.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest assigning an identifier for the customer based on a result of a determination that

the information in the first and the second data records are associated with the customer. The Walker '534 patent only discloses that an identifier may be created in the customer and CPO databases, but does not otherwise teach or suggest that an identifier is assigned based on information in each of the customer and CPO databases. Moreover, the Sprenger '388 patent does teach or suggest that that an identifier is assigned for the customer based on a determination that the information in the first and the second data records are associated with the customer, as recited in independent Claim 1. Rather, the Sprenger '388 patent only discloses that identifiers are compared to one another but not that an identifier is assigned as a result of such a comparison. Because neither the Walker '534 patent nor the Sprenger '388 patent, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests assigning an identifier for the customer based on a result of a determination that the information in the first and the second data records are associated with the customer, as recited by independent Claim 1, the combination also fails to disclose Claim 1.

For each of the foregoing reasons, independent Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the Walker '534 patent and the Sprenger '388 patent, either individually or in combination. Independent Claims 7, 13, 19, 23, and 25 also include comparable features to those discussed above in conjunction with independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 7, 13, 19, 23, and 25 are not taught or suggested by the Walker '534 patent and the Sprenger '388 patent, taken either individually or in combination. Because the dependent claims depend from and include each of the elements of independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23, and 25, the Walker '534 patent and the Springer '388 patent, taken either individually or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest dependent Claims 2-12, 14-18, 20-22, 24, and 26-47 for at least the same reasons as described above in conjunction with a respective independent claim.

Although the dependent claims are not taught or suggested by the Walker '534 patent and the Springer '388 patent, taken either individually or in combination, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23, and 25, Applicants submit that several of the dependent claims are further patentably distinguishable from the cited references. For example, none of the cited references teaches or suggests Claims 3, 9, 15, 21, and 30, which recite that the identifying information includes a storage identifier to identify an

electronic storage facility. In this regard, the Walker '534 patent does not teach or suggest that any of the databases includes a storage identifier to identify an electronic storage facility. Similarly, the Sprenger '388 patent does not teach or suggest a database that includes a storage identifier to identify an electronic storage facility.

Moreover, none of the cited references teaches or suggests Claims 5, 11 and 17, which recite standardizing the received identifying information. For example, the present application discloses that the CDNA system may transform and clean the customer data to a standardized form (see p. 10, ¶ 31). In contrast, the Walker '534 patent only discloses that the customer inputs information into the customer database but does not suggest the information is standardized into any particular. In addition, the Sprenger '388 patent nowhere teaches or suggests standardizing the received identifying information.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least dependent Claims 3, 5, 9, 11, 15, 17, 21, and 30 are further patentably distinguishable from the cited references in addition to those reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance. We therefore respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Trent A. Kirk
Registration No. 54,223

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON November 28, 2007.